

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action dated October 28, 2003. Claims 1-14 are pending. Claims 1-14 are rejected. Claims 1, 5, 9, and 12 have been amended. No claims have been canceled. Accordingly, claims 1-14 remain pending in the present application.

Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 USC 1039a) as being unpatentable over Peterson, "The Profile Name Service", 1988 (hereinafter "Peterson"). The examiner states:

As per claim 1:

Peterson discloses a Profile Naming Architecture (creation tool) (Page 343, Figures 1) that provides accessibility to a collection of resources (applications) (Page 343, Figure 1, Access resource by Name). The architecture provides that each naming resource is created by a corresponding principle (A component) (see page 343, line 2, 'DonoteP', and see section 2.1, Attributes for {attribute1, attribute2, ...} --> p). Peterson's teaching covers the claim limitation:

"An application creation tool (Page 343, Figure 1), comprising: a first Component (see page 343, section 2.1, for each p for example p1: will be {attribute1, attribute2, ...} --> p1), wherein a name of the first component in accordance with a naming scheme is based on a plurality of attributes for an application which the first component creates (see {attribute1, attribute2, ...} --> p); and a second component (see page 343, section 2.1, for each p, for example p2: will be {attribute11, attribute22, ...} --> p2), wherein a name of the second component in accordance with the naming scheme is based on the plurality of attributes for the application (see {attribute1, attribute2, ...} --> p) which the second component creates".

Peterson teaches a creation of a collection of resources that is accessed by naming service based on a generic set of attribute principles.

Peterson lacks addressing about application creation. However, Peter's naming service accesses an arbitrary collection of resources for conforming to attribute principle (see page 346, four sets, particularly see page 359, section 5, 1, 7).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to include an application that conforms to attribute principle in the teaching of Peterson for easing accessibility. Doing so would easily and directly access an application based on naming profile...

As per claims 5, 9, 12: Claim 5, claim 9 and claim 12 are a system, a method and a computer readable medium, respectively, that have the claiming functionality corresponding to the application tool as recited by claim 1. Claim 5, claim 9, and claim 12 are rejected in the same reason as set forth in connecting to the rejection of claim 1...

Applicant respectfully disagrees as to the claims as amended. The present invention

provides, an application creation tool comprising: a first component, wherein a name of the first component in accordance with a naming scheme is a concatenation of values for a plurality of attributes for an application which the first component creates; and a second component, wherein a name of the second component in accordance with the naming scheme is a concatenation of values for the plurality of attributes for the application which the second component creates. (See examples in Specification at p. 7, line 17 through p. 5, line 20.)

In contrast, Peterson discloses a naming scheme based on attributes for principle objects. The attributes for the principle objects are registered with a database. (pp. 343-340) Peterson then uses an algorithm to identify one or more principles that may match the attributes in the name. (pp. 345 et. seq.) However, Peterson does not disclose a naming scheme where the name of a principle or component is a concatenation of a plurality of attributes.

The naming scheme for a component in accordance with the present invention, as recited in amended independent claims 1, 5, 9, and 12, is a concatenation of values for the plurality of attributes for the application which the component creates. The concatenation of the values in the name is significant since the naming scheme is for application creation tools. The partial or possible matching disclosed in Peterson is not precise enough to identify the correct component in a meaningful way.

Thus, Peterson does not teach or suggest a naming scheme where a name of a component in accordance with a naming scheme is a concatenation of values for a plurality of attributes for an application which the component creates, as recited in amended independent claims 1, 5, 9, and 12. Applicant further submits that claims 2-4, 6-8, 10-11, and 13-14 are also allowable because they depend on the above allowable base claims.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that claims 1-14 are patentable over the cited reference. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the claims

as now presented.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon has been reviewed and does not appear to be any more relevant than the applied references.

Applicants' attorney believes this application in condition for allowance. Should any unresolved issues remain, Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,
SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP

March 1, 2004

Date



Michele Liu
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 44,875
(650) 493-4540